

REMARKS

The Declaration has been objected to as being defective. The Examiner has requested that the applicant submit another copy. Accordingly, the original Declaration signed by the inventor is filed herewith. Acceptance of the original Declaration is respectfully requested.

The title of the invention is objected to as not being descriptive. The applicant has amended the title as suggested by the Examiner. Acceptance of the new title is respectfully requested.

The disclosure has been objected to because the section headings are underlined. The specification is amended herein to remove the underlines from the section headings.

The specification has been amended to correct the discrepancy between "pattern history bit" and "pattern history bits". The inconsistencies referred to by the Examiner have been remedied. Reconsideration is requested.

On page 2, line 27, the title of the invention has been corrected.

The Examiner has requested clarification with regard to the statement in the specification at page 5 line 29 through page 6 line 1 regarding "the most recent k conditional branches". In response to the Examiner's inquiry, the present invention uses the most recent k conditional branches, regardless of whether it is the same conditional branch or a different conditional branch. That is, if a local branch predictor is used, the present invention uses the most k recent occurrences of the same conditional branch. If a global branch predictor is used, the invention uses the actual most recent k conditional branches. The present invention can be adaptable to both local and global branch predictors.

Reconsideration of all of the objections to the specification is respectfully requested.

The drawings are objected to because Figure 2 refers to "accuracy history bits." The term "accuracy history bits" is correct. Accordingly, the specification is amended to clarify the discrepancy. Reconsideration of the objection to the drawings is requested.

Application Number 09/693,157  
Amendment dated February 27, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 27, 2003

Claim 8 is amended to refer to the most significant bit of the at least one accuracy history bit. It is believed that the objection to the claim is overcome.

Claim 1 is objected to because of the term "a conditional branch." The claim is amended as the Examiner has suggested. It is believed that the objection is overcome.

Reconsideration of the objections to the claims is requested.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manne in view of Hennessy. In view of the following remarks, the rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

The Manne paper is not available as a prior art reference in the present application. The information available to the applicant is that the earliest possible publication date of the Manne paper is October 12, 1999. A Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 is enclosed herewith to swear behind the Manne paper. The present application was filed in the United States Patent and Trademark Office on October 20, 2000, claiming priority to Korean Patent Application No. 1999-45786, which was filed on October 21, 1999. The claim for priority to the Korean application was made upon filing the U.S. application on October 20, 2000. A certified copy of the priority document was filed with the application. An English-language translation of the priority document is enclosed herewith. The English-language translation is filed because it is needed in the application to swear behind the Manne reference. Accordingly, the priority claim in the present application is perfected. Therefore, the effective filing date of the present application is October 21, 1999.

In the Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, two documents are attached as Exhibits. Exhibit 1 is the invention disclosure submitted by the applicant to the Assignee of the application, Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. The disclosure is dated April 29, 1999. Accordingly, the invention was in possession of the inventor and was disclosed by the inventor on April 29, 1999, at the latest. Exhibit 2 of the Declaration is a set of view graphs which describe and disclose the invention. The set of view graphs is dated May 18, 1999. Either of these Exhibits taken alone proves that the inventor had possession of and disclosed the conception of the

Application Number 09/693,157  
Amendment dated February 27, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 27, 2003

invention before the publication date of the Manne paper, which was October 12, 1999 at the earliest.


The Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 also establishes that the inventor and his assignee and attorneys made diligent and continuous efforts between at least a time just before the October 12, 1999 publication date of the Manne paper and the filing date of the Korean application, October 21, 1999, the effective filing date of the present application.

Accordingly, the inventor in the present application has an invention date which precedes the publication date of the Manne paper. Therefore, the Manne paper is not available as a prior art reference against the present application. Therefore, the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Manne and Hennessy is not applicable to the present application. It is respectfully requested that the rejection under 37 C.F.R. § 103(a) based on Manne and Hennessy be removed.

In view of the amendments to the application and the foregoing remarks, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully solicited. If a telephone conference will expedite prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/27/04  
Mills & Onello, LLP  
Eleven Beacon Street, Suite 605  
Boston, MA 02108  
Telephone: (617) 994-4900  
Facsimile: (617) 742-7774  
J:\SAM\0162\amendmenta.wpd

  
Steven M. Mills  
Registration Number 36,610  
Attorney for Applicants